

**JOINT ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING  
PARKS & CULTURAL AFFAIRS  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & ENERGY  
of the  
Suffolk County Legislature**

**Minutes**

A Joint Environment, Land Acquisition & Planning, Parks & Cultural Affairs, Economic Development & Energy Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium at the William Rogers Legislative Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on **October 26, 2001** at 9:00 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator David Bishop  
Legislator Cameron Alden  
Legislator Caracappa  
Legislator Jon Cooper  
Legislator Angie Carpenter  
Legislator Ginny Fields

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Peter Scully, Commissioner of Suffolk County Parks  
Diana Cherryholmes, Huntington Arts Council  
Barbara Russo, Department of Suffolk County Parks  
Alice Amhrein, Commissioner of Economic Development  
Carolyn Fahey, Assistant to the Commissioner of Economic Development  
Allen Kovesdy, County Executive Office - Budget  
Fred DeFay, Suffolk County Forum for Arts  
Sean Clancy, Budget Review Office  
Nicole DeAngelo, County Executive's Office I.R.  
Clark Gavin, Presiding Officer Paul Tonna's Office  
Jim Dobkowski, Press Secretary to Presiding Officer Paul Tonna  
Kathy Wattecamps, Development Associated  
Fred Pollert, Director of Budget Review  
Jim Spero, Assistant Director of Budget Review  
Sally Foulke, Inventory Director, Cornell Cooperative Extension  
Tom Isles, Director Suffolk County Planning Department  
Ken Washington, Project Director, Suffolk Community Council  
Gerard McCreight, Aide to Legislator Jon Cooper  
All Interested Parties

**Minutes taken and transcribed by Irene Kulesa, Legislative Secretary**

***(The meeting came to order at 9:05 P.M.)***

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Welcome to the Joint Parks, Sports, Cultural Affairs and Economic Development Budget Hearing. Is this Environment as well? And Environment. What do you know? Will everyone please rise for a salute to the Flag led by Legislator Carpenter?

**SALUTATION**

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Once again, this is Budget Hearings for the 2002 Operating Budget. First up, why don't we bring up Commissioner Scully? Good morning Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to be here. I thought that perhaps it would be helpful for us to comment on some of the observations and recommendations in the BRO Report recognizing that in some instances, this information is now available that was not available to the department at the time it made its original budget submittal. And in some cases, it was not available to BRO Staff at the time it made some of those observations. If that's okay, I'll attempt to do that.

Now, first I should say that I certainly do recognize the challenge that the Legislature faces this year and that it's not going to be an easy budget process. So we appreciate that and recognize that in the final analysis we'll live with whatever budget is provided for us and do the very best job that we can.

On the issue of fees, the BRO Report recommends an increase in golf fees and we have since become aware that BRO Staff is really now taking a look at our overall fee schedule. And we surmise that that's with an eye towards making a recommendation as to whether other adjustments to the fee schedule may be warranted past just the golf fees. And in that regard, I just wanted to point out that the schedule hasn't been adjusted since 1999 and it's some of the fees that contains -- haven't been adjusted for far longer than that. Marina fees, for example and outer beach fees have not been increased since 1996 and 1997. We brought with us today, updated revenue figures for the first three-quarters of this year. We're seeing some growth in areas that we hadn't anticipated and we'll be happy to provide that data to BRO, so that they can take that into account. That's good news.

As you know, it's always a balancing act between trying to cover more of our costs and keeping the activities that we offer affordable for the residents and we appreciate that that's an issue that needs to be dealt with. The reason that the increase we're seeing in revenues isn't important is because the estimates contained in the BRO Report do not take into account, we believe, the impact of some of the exemptions recently approved, in which my staff indicates particularly, those exemptions could cost as much as five hundred thousand dollars in 2002. And the County makes a policy decision on these exemptions because they believe it's the right thing to do. But it's important to keep in mind that these do have some impacts and we try to project what those are the best that we can. And we'll be happy to work with BRO to make sure that they understand the basis for those projections.

Another issue in the BRO Report was the issue of funding organic parks maintenance out of Fund 477, the new Drinking Water Program. And I regret that I did not have an opportunity to speak with the BRO Staff on that issue. BRO Staff questions whether or not funding these activities would be an appropriate expense, given the language in the law. And as I said, I regret not having had the opportunity to speak with them because I believe there's plain and clear language that makes this an appropriate use of that funding. You should be aware, some of you are, I know that Legislator Alden has been interested that the proposal that utilizes this funding to address non-point source pollution at the Great South Bay and the Peconic Bay is an outgrowth of an application process implemented by the Planning Department, which came to us and indicated that we should consider seeking funding for this purpose. That application is still pending and I guess that the County Executive's Budget included this proposal as part of the 2002 Operating Budget. Some of you have copies of our submittals. We're very proud of them. I'll make them available to those of you who don't.

The observation that the implementation of the Bishop bill may be delayed. I guess it's valid and it could push back the schedule for some of the costs. I would just remind you that the backdrop against which the increased staffing and equipment needs of the golf courses should be considered as the realization that with or without organic parks requirements, which we have been implementing for the past four or five years, those courses according to a survey by the PGA, those courses are woefully understaffed and under-equipped, organic parks maintenance or not. So that's something we all should keep in mind. With respect to historic services --

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Commissioner, could you just hold on one second before we go on to the next topic? Legislator Carpenter has a question relating to fees.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Yes, I know you had said you were going to have some dialog with Budget Review. I think it would be helpful, if you could, areas of the fees that you feel could or should be increased, perhaps you could get that information to them pretty quickly.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

Certainly, I think that's a good idea. I think that the point that you're making Legislator Carpenter is that if the fees are going to be increased, doing it as part of the budget process would be the best way to do it and we agree. So we'll be happy to make that information available.

In the area of historic services, BRO made some observations about the need to stay on top of repairs of structures. We currently have 191 buildings in the departmental inventory that are either designated or eligible to be designated as historic structures. And BRO made an observation that building needs survey of those structures has not been updated since 1996. That's a good observation and I think it prompts us to look at the issue anew. I've spoken with the Director of Historic Services and directed him to begin surveying each of the structures, at least once a year in 2002. But the ability to restore and maintain historic structures and the end analysis boils down to resources. I'd be less than honest if I didn't indicate to you that the resources that we are provided are not adequate to the task. I think that the department has shown in the case of Deepwells and Meadowcroft what it can do if provided with proper resources and the types of things that can happen. But it is also a fact that there are numerous historic structures in the department's inventory, which really need attention and require resources. And for that reason, I was a little bit surprised that BRO Staff did not observe that the recommended budget would reduce funding significantly for building materials and repairs. The building repair line, for example, would be eliminated entirely. It was twenty thousand dollars this year and the building materials would be cut by about 81 percent from twenty one thousand dollars to just four thousand dollars in 2002.

With regard to the personnel sections of the BRO Report, I need to make a couple of brief comments regarding BRO's observation that the recommended budget includes positions that the department did not request. First and with respect to our proposed addition of an Assistant Security Director Title, the fact is and I apologize to BRO for not making it clear earlier that the department did request the addition of that title only after our original budget submittal and we essentially traded in another position in order to get that. That budget analyst position. We believe that the need is real because our Security Director who oversees the park police, recruitment and training lifeguards, EMT's for all the beaches and training the security personnel we use in the summer months to augment the parks police force. It's also serving on three of the Councils protecting the Pine Barrens, the Protective Lands Council, the Law Enforcement Council and Wildfire Task Force. These are some of the inevitable additional work requirements that fall to the department as a result of the Pine Barrens Protection Act. And by expanding our administrative capability in that regard by swapping it and existing position, there's no net increase in positions as a result of that addition. So I'm hopeful that maybe the Legislature will see fit to sustain the County Executive's recommendation in that regard.

With respect to the five new park police positions that are proposed in the recommended budget, some of you may be aware that the Park Trustees have been addressing the issue of a real near crisis situation with park police staffing. There are numerous issues addressed in a report recently completed but one of the recommendations that it makes is the addition of ten new park police positions to the force, which is at about -- it's less than half of what it was 25 years ago, full time staff wise. I guess that the County Executive's recommended budget proposes half of what was recommended by the Park Trustees.

Two other issues. Briefly, one of the issue of temporary salaries.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Excuse me? On the issue of the park police positions, I saw a copy of the memo that you

sent and I'm sorry I don't have it with me on the number of incidents of the -- I guess it was the month of September, in the parks and I think that is important information to share because it was a lot.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

I think that's a point well taken. There are two reasons why I filled that monthly report to members of the Parks Committee. One is to convey an understanding that a position of park police officer is not that of a security guard or a park ranger. There are numerous criminal activities, which the officers are confronted with every day. And if you're provided with a monthly report showing what types of complaints, arrests and what have you, are addressed by the park police, you quickly realize that the reason that they're forced to undergo the same type of rigorous training and security checks that a police officer undergoes, is because their responsibilities are roughly akin. That's not to say that these ladies and gentlemen are out in some of the more dangerous communities in our County but they certainly are providing the same type of enforcement capabilities in the park system. And we have hundreds of families staying overnight in campgrounds. They have a right to feel secure, so that's important. And if the point that you're making Legislator Carpenter, is that I should make sure each of the Legislators get those reports, I will do that.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

At least, as we're in the midst this budget process.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

Thanks for that suggestion. On the issue of temporary salaries, we see that BRO observed that the recommended budget proposes a hundred and five thousand dollars more than the department's original request and that's an accurate statement. But the recommendation to reduce the funding by a hundred and five thousand dollars would leave this line under-funded for 2002. The point here is that it's a timing issue. At the time of our original submittal, we had not had the benefit of the 2001 summer season to judge what our actual expenditure experience would be in this regard. The department is a seasonal department, it's true and for that reason many of our facilities are operated by temporary or part time personnel in season. That includes facilities such as the Smith Point Campground, the other booth of which is operated entirely by part time personnel. They are revenue producing facilities and we have a -- in that instance, Smith Point is a good example because the work demand is high. We essentially have five different facilities at Smith's Point. We have the beach itself and the pavilion, the management, the same. The Campground where hundreds of families are there, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. And outer beach -- the beach area, which is increasingly popular. The youth area, which is so important to Legislator Towle, who is not with us and then the marina. The point being on temporary salaries that if it's under-funded, it will be overspent and I don't think that's in anybody's best interest. So I bring that to your attention.

Finally with respect to vehicles and I'm sure that this is an issue that the Department of Public --

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

If I could just make a point on the issue of the seasonals? I know that even at a park like Gardner Park in the western part of the County where we traditionally have seasonals, the public, as you are aware from the letters that I forwarded to you, like the presence of people there all the time. You know they do use the park in the winter and like that feeling of attention that they're getting and that the parks are getting the attention. They can see visibly that, you know the litter is not there when you've got someone on the premises. So that even though it seems like some of these are seasonal operations, the needs might spike more in the summertime but it's a diminishing of the need, not an elimination.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

You know Legislator Carpenter; I have to apologize because you raise an issue I should have raised with respect to temporary salaries. And that is that what we're seeing more and more is that there's more of what I would call shoulder season and year round use of certain -- of our facilities than there have been in past years. And in order for us to staff up to meet that

need, we're keeping temporary personnel and part time and seasonal personnel past Labor Day and hiring them earlier in the spring and that's one of the reasons why we see increased expenditures in this area. You know, it's a fact that the Parks Department is in the midst of very trying financial times, I guess and the department of which is growing to meet growing demands. So that point is well taken.

Now finally on the issue of vehicles. I believe that the Department of Public Works are primarily responsible for working with the Legislature on this issue. But quite frankly, we were a little bit confused by BRO's recommendation on these issues and maybe we'll get a chance to speak with them a little bit further. Our understanding is that there is a basic policy utilized by the Department of Public Works for replacement vehicles. They calculate based on usage what vehicles will require replacement in a coming year. I don't think there's any mystery to that. That should be fairly straightforward. The recommended budget proposed replacement of three unmarked sedans for the park police, two which are already decommissioned and one of which -- and an undercover vehicle, it has a 131 thousand miles on it. The conclusion that the replacements are needed and that the department should coordinate its undercover activities with the Police Department confuses us a little bit.

The issue of some pickup trucks, which are utilized in field and whether or not those require replacement, I guess that's a matter for the Legislature and BRO to work out with DPW. Because I understand again that they have a basic policy that says, we anticipate this vehicle now has this many miles on it and we anticipate that it's going to run this many miles over the coming year and it will require replacement. There was a blanket statement made in the report that they're not needed because we have a certain number of vehicles purchased between 1995 and 1999. I guess that's not our bailiwick to fight. But I would point out that we have been successful with the help of the Legislature and the County Executive in making some minimal expansion of the workforce in parks, which is still 40 percent less than it was twenty five years ago. And the increased demand associated with the expansion of facilities like the Smith Point Campground requires both people and resources and those resources include vehicles. I'm not talking about cars or SUV's. I'm talking about things like pickup trucks. And while it's not part of this budget process, the department has been struggling with the issue of trying to approach both branches and say could you take a look at whether or not some minimal expansion of the vehicle fleet is warranted in light of increased demand for services here. That's not a discussion for today but it is a discussion we'd like to have in the coming months. And for that reason, any proposal not to replace vehicles that require replacement would just put us further behind.

So I offer those comments to you respectfully. I'm prepared to answer any questions that you may have and we look forward to working closely with both branches and providing updated information to BRO on revenues and I'm proposed -- any proposed amendment to the fee schedule.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Any questions?

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

One question? You just said that as far as the workforce is concerned, it's 40 percent less now than it was twenty five years ago. Tell us what the inventory of the parkland is that you're responsible for now than it was twenty five years ago?

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

In 1994, a parks policy plan was completed, which offered both some recommendations and a good historical baseline with regard to departmental resources. And if I recall correctly, high water mark staff wise was 260 full time positions in 1976, when the department had eleven thousand acres to maintain and we currently have 167 budgeted positions and we're approaching forty four thousand acres, so we have four times as much property and a little bit more than half the staff we did at that time.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Thank you.



**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

With relation to the park police? Commissioner, know that the Omnibus Committee has been discussing that at length. We do feel it's a concern and a priority. But just as a fail-safe type of measure, I'd like for the five that were --Budget Review recommends that we don't add, I'd like a stand-alone prepared for that. Add five park police and add Legislator Carpenter as a co-sponsor. Okay. Any other questions? Thank you Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY:**

Thank you for your time.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Chairman Cooper, we're going to do the Economic Development portion now and I'm going to turn it over to the Chairman of the Committee of Economic Development and that is Chairman Cooper, the floor is yours.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Good morning. I'm Alice Amhreine; Commissioner of Economic Development and with me is Carolyn Fahey, my assistant. There are two issues in the Economic Development Budget I'd like to address and both of them concern recommendations in the Legislative Budget Review Report. One of the recommendations is that the County portion of the Cultural Affairs money be eliminated for the Year 2002. This is approximately two hundred and twenty thousand dollars. That's 100 percent County funded. We also have the hotel, motel tax, which is dependent upon the collection.

I believe that at this time that it would be imprudent to remove this money because the tourism out in Suffolk County is also contingent upon the cultural activities. And there have been studies shown that people participate in the cultural activities. That they come out here to go to the different productions. They go to the farm stands. They go to the concerts. And I think, you saw even after the World Trade Center that one of the things that New York City immediately did was start to bolster up its cultural activities to bring more tourism back. So since we're already seeing a decrease in the hotel usage, I don't want to further exacerbate it by not having the activities funded that people to come to see.

The second thing was that the Legislative Budget Review recommended that we not include money for outside appraisals for Gabreski Airport. The Suffolk County Real Estate Department has advised us that they do not have the staff in-house to do these appraisals. They consider them special appraisals because they are actually long-term 40-year leases and that they need outside individuals to do those appraisals. We have quite a bit of interest in Gabreski Airport at the minute and in order to proceed with leasing the property; I need the appraisals done. So those are the two issues that I would like to raise with the committee.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Alice, setting aside for a moment the General Fund portion of the cultural arts spending? The projection, perhaps optimistic projection of two to fifteen thousand dollars plus, generated from the hotel, motel tax, how does that compare to the previous year? Do you have that information?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

It's actually been decreased. Even before the World Trade Center, there had been projections that this year, they have seen a decrease in hotel occupancy, particularly in the west. Not so much in the East End but in the West End because there had been a reduction of conferences and conventions coming into the hotel. So the Budget Office had already decreased their projections. Whether there should be a further decrease? I don't think that we should look at that at the minute because these funds are only allocated, based on their collection. So if the money does not come in, then the funds will not be expended and if they are expended, they'll be recouped in a future year.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Do you have any information regarding the possible economic ramifications, if we were to cut the General Fund portion of the cultural arts funding? If that was to be eliminated, does anyone have any information as to what the impact could be on the general community?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I don't know if I have a specific dollar amount but when I go back to my office, I know I've collected a few articles on the relationship between cultural affairs and tourism and I'll try to pull them out and make copies for the committee.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Any questions?

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Just on the issue of the cultural arts funding? I know that it has been a struggle over the past years to try to raise the level of the funding and certainly, we don't want to look to Nassau County as an example. But they have invested quite heavily in cultural arts funding over the years and our investment in it has been really minimal in comparison. But even other, you know, counties across the State, I would say that we are not at the top, as far as dollars invested in cultural arts. And there is a multiplier number and I'm not sure what it is and perhaps you can get it for us; as to what every dollar invested in cultural arts comes back to us in economic development activity.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I know I have some articles in my office and I'll go through it. I'll pull some of it out. It discusses the relationship between tourism, economic development and cultural affairs.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Alice also is there any State funding that's provided for cultural affairs locally? How has -- what's been happening at the State level impacted that? Do you know?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

There are State Cultural Affairs Grants. They are actually channeled down here, I believe, through the Huntington Arts Council. They act as a conduit for a lot of the State funding. And right now, I don't know what the status of it is. Reading the paper, I'm aware the State has put some additional funding back into the State Budget for non-profit. But I don't have any information on what percent of that would be dedicated to cultural affairs.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

That's actually a perfect segue to our next speaker who is from the Huntington Arts Council but --

**LEGISLATOR FIELDS:**

Mr. Chairman?

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Sure?

**LEGISLATOR FIELDS:**

Alice, we discussed a little bit, I think, it was yesterday or the day before about the airport, Gabreski Airport and security. Has anything happened since that discussion? Have we become a little more comfortable with the security at the airport?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Well, I indicated the other day since the September 11th, even prior to the September 11th, was that when the department was transferred to me in January, I assessed the security situation and determined we needed some improvement, which is why we have the Capital Project for fencing. Since that time and since September 11th, we have beefed up security

at the airport through the intervention of some of the police agencies, including right now that the Sheriff is patrolling. We also have DPW put in some traffic barriers to prevent unauthorized access onto the runway. The number of incidents that we have had since September 11th, have been minor. We have had -- and not necessarily -- I mean, we have had no terrorist activity but we've had people who have managed to gain access to the runway area and we've had them removed. But most of it is through -- sort of a failure to recognize that they shouldn't be on the runway.

**LEGISLATOR FIELDS:**

But are you happy with that kind of security? I mean, do you feel that it's adequate for Suffolk County?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I believe there are other things that we should be doing. And the group that we have met with, which includes the Sheriff, the Southampton Town Police, the Air National Guard, the State Police and the Suffolk County Police are going to be meeting twice a month to review the proposed recommendation from the Federal Aviation Administration and determine what ones should be implemented at the airport. And we are not a commercial airport but we do get large very expensive corporate jets and we're talking forty to fifty million dollars per plane. So we really want to safeguard that.

**LEGISLATOR FIELDS:**

Do you also have flight training?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

We have two flight training schools, which we have already been in correspondence with the FBI on. And at this point, we have no reason to suspect that we have a problem. But the FBI is, you know, nationwide; they're paying particular attention to flight schools.

**LEGISLATOR FIELDS:**

Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Legislator Carpenter.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

In mentioning the airport and the fact that you have expensive corporate jets landing there, reminded me that we had looked at some fees that the County has generated and the fees, the landing fees that we've collected are two thousand dollars and it seems to me that's woefully low. Do you have any information on what those fees are? When they were last adjusted?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I actually have the resolution with the landing fees and it is my intent at some point to propose higher landing fees. But at the minute, the airport had so many structural problems that we're attempting to remedy that. Until we bring the airport up to a higher level of service, we probably can't get higher landing fees. But there's -- the area I'm thinking of -- only the landing fees is that any aircraft that lands there, which involves a lot of the corporate planes, if they're serviced by one of our two fixed base operators, the landing fees are waived. Because when they land there, they are then purchasing fuel. So the other revenue that you see generated by the airport, we get a certain percentage of all the fuel pumped at the airport. So the landing fees are just minor compared to the revenue we're generating by fuel pumping.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Well, how is it handled at the other airports where these corporate jets can land? Do they have that kind of an arrangement if they're landing there and they are fueling up that their landing fees are waived?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I have a report I can give you that shows all of the airports in Suffolk County. I did a



comparison between Gabreski Airport and all the other airports that shows exactly what they charge. What services they provide. What staffing they have versus our airport. So I'll be happy to give that to you.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Okay, great and also if you could make sure that Budget Review gets it and rather quickly, because that was one of the areas that the working group for the committee was looking at.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Carolyn indicates to me and I gather -- the Budget Review, they have a copy of that report.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

But you said that you were looking at the fees and some projected, you know possible changes in the near future when improvements are made. Did you say that? I would like you to share that with them, now, not later.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I'm not --

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Did you not say that you were --?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

We have shared with them.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Had a resolution to do something with the fees? But you were holding it pending improvements?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I have the resolution that set up the fees at the airport.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Um-um.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Which was done a number of years ago. I know what the other airports are charging for fees. At the minute, Gabreski Airport, half the time has no lighting. We don't have an ILS system for, you know, runway access. So we have a number of physical improvements we need to make to the airport to bring it up to the same level as the other airports.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

I understand that, however, by your own words, you said expensive corporate jets are landing there.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Okay. So if these expensive corporate jets are landing there, I think, we should be compensated for whatever we can be compensated for regardless of whether the amenities are there, the improvements are there, they're still landing there. And absent the revenue generation to do these improvements, it's going to wind up being a catch 22. Nothing is going to be done because you're not generating revenue and you're not generating revenue because you didn't do anything.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I indicated that the landing fees are the smaller part of the revenue. The major part of the revenue is that when the corporate jet lands, they either go to one of our two fixed based operators. When they land there, they get jet fuel. We get a percentage of all the jet fuel.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

I understand that. I did hear you say that.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

That's our chief source of revenue.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

When was the percentage? I mean is that contractually? Do we have an agreement with them that they give us X percentage for how long? When was the last time it was looked at? When was the last time it was adjusted?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

They're on a long-term lease. So I don't believe there's any way of adjusting that until the lease is finished. But I can check into that too.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

And how that compensation structure compares with the other regional airports?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

That's all in the report, I have.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

All right. Yes, I would be really curious to see that. Also, when we're on the airport, I was there a couple of weeks ago and I guess, it was Legislator Guldi, who mentioned that one of the tenants and I guess, it's towards the southeast part of the airport. There's a stand alone building there where the guys got equipment in there and its been there for years and he hasn't paid rent for years. And that's a situation that I find very troubling and very disturbing and do you know who I'm talking about?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I'm not aware of anyone that's out there that hasn't paid rent in years. We have a number of collection problems with our rent. But when the Legislature transferred the airport to me, they forgot to transfer any of the accounting staff of DPW. So for an entire year, I've been trying to hire an accountant person. In the interim, DPW is doing a lot of rental payments. So until I get the accounting person under my purview and I can get them to go over all these leases, I have a problem with collecting back rent.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Have you mentioned the fact that you had no accounting personnel? I mean this is the first I'm hearing about it.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

I have the position in the budget. I've gone through two Civil Service Lists and have not been able to hire anyone who would take the job. I'm waiting for the third Civil Service List in December to interview for the third time for the position. It's not that the position isn't there and it's not that we're not actively recruiting for it but I have to get that position filled to transfer all of the accounting records for the airport to the Department of Economic Development.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

The accounting procedures for the airport? Is that a full time position?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Yes.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

So if this was being done by DPW and there was someone there doing that function, what are

they doing now if they're not doing the airport?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

They're still doing the airport because we can't take it over. And the Commissioner of Public Works has been -- he's been nice enough to afford me to use his staff for an entire year to do a function that's no longer their responsibility.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Alice, just getting back briefly to the issue of the landing fees and the takeoff fees? Looking at it in the most optimistic fashion possible. If the new fee schedule was implemented, how much money -- how much additional monies could be generated, approximately?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Well, first of all we have to determine what we would want the fees to be. We're only getting about two thousand dollars now.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

All right, so best case, what do you think this -- could you increase to?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Four thousand.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

But the fuel for getting more corporate jets in is a far larger source of revenue. But the only way to get more planes in is to improve the airport, so that more planes can fly in. Because we've actually seen a decrease in the number of planes coming in, because they can't fly in in bad weather, because we don't have the equipment for them to come in. And we are working on this with the lighting project and with the Air National Guard.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Thank you. Legislator Caracappa.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Thanks. Just taking that a bit further from what you're saying. Outside the lease agreements with the companies that are flying in. Do you feel that if we raise the landing fees and the other associated fees with the airplanes themselves that we potentially lose some of that business? And have those corporate jets flying into MacArthur to be serviced there, let's say at Garret Aviation? And getting the fuel supply there as opposed to coming to Gabreski and then losing that what you said was a main source of revenue? In addition to that, without the lighting project up and running yet and the other infrastructure improvements to the airport, do we run the risk by raising fees substantially that we lose the business altogether?

**COMMISSIONER AMHREIN:**

Actually, I do have the airport fee structure. Right now for Gabreski, for a private plane, for a single engine, we charge two dollars. For a twin engine, we charge three dollars. East Hampton charges the same rate and Brookhaven is actually less. So we're not -- when we're talking about the landing fees for a small private plane, we're not talking a great deal of money. Now, if we went to three dollars a single engine, nine dollars for a commercial large or single engine, we would -- we might be slightly higher than East Hampton. But it wouldn't make a difference because a lot of these big planes can't land at East Hampton. They are too big. What's happened right now is Republic Airport has been shut down significantly because of the New York City disaster. So they still -- they've lost a lot of air traffic because the planes cannot come in and land there. So we have seen some increased traffic out at Gabreski. They've seen an increase traffic at MacArthur and also at Collabro. But between MacArthur has so much commercial aircraft at the minute, they're not really looking for more

the corporate, so Collabro is but they're a lot smaller. East Hampton is but they're a lot smaller, which is why Gabreski is in such a good position to pick up your corporate aircraft.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

My question was, do we run the risk of losing that business by maybe raising the fees too much?

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Well, if we raise them too much, but if we had a modest increase, I don't believe so.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

That's where I was going to -- because I would support that along with Legislator Carpenter. And I'm sure that's something, we'll be discussing throughout the budget process, thank you.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Thank you very much Alice. Next speaker is Diana Cherryholmes.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Downtown Revitalization Program is that renewed in the Operating Budget?

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

It was just a legislative resolution on the 23rd, to move the money into the Capital Account.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

That's the 2000 money.

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Well, it's actually -- it would be for around --

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

2001 money, right?

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Two, three and four. There is an additional, in the budget, three hundred and eighty seven thousand dollars.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Which is a cut --

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

That's for the 2002.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Is that a cut or an additional over last year's Operating?

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Well, if all the money gets moved to the Capital, then it's additional funding.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

The 2001 Operating Budget, the one that we're in now proposed how much for Downtown Revitalization?

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Five hundred thousand.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

And the 2002 says three eighty-seven but envisions this movement of money, still has to preserve it? That's the bottom?

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Please repeat the question?

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

It's more rhetorical. I know it to be true. The other -- that's right, okay. The other -- just to follow up on what Legislator Carpenter was getting at. Landing fees at Gabreski, do we have the ability as a -- between the Legislature and the Executive to raise those fees? Or is there somebody in between that we need to --

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

No, I believe the fees are set by the Suffolk Legislature.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Okay, thank you.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Thank you again, Alice. The next speaker now is Diana Cherryholmes representing the Huntington Arts Council. Good morning Diana.

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

Good morning. I have a statement and I think you probably have some questions for me about some of the funding for greater Suffolk County Cultural Organizations. My name again, is Diana Cherryholmes. I'm the Executive Director of the Huntington Arts Council. And I'd like to thank you very much for your support of the programs at the Huntington Arts Council and for the support of our over ninety member organizations. Your support has allowed the Huntington Art Council to produce the Huntington Summer Arts Festival. That's a series of 51 nights in the summer. We attract approximately 90 thousand people during the summer months. We estimate that 40 percent of those in attendance come from greater Suffolk County. Your support also provides funding for our Education Program, which serves 30 thousand youths in seven school districts. It also provides assistance for our training workshops for teachers. We have a series of five cultural arts workshops that teachers receive in-service credit for.

The current economic outlook for the arts and cultural organization is quite scary right now. Many of these organizations are considering drastic cutbacks to staff and programs and some may even fold. The arts are not a luxury because very simply, the arts surround us in our daily lives and are constant. Support for the arts at the local level increases our local economy, teaches our children how to think more expressively and creates greater self-esteem. Support for the arts is part of the solution to a variety of social problems facing us today. And as mentioned already this morning, it attracts tourists and their dollars. I'm here this morning to ask you to continue to support the Office of Cultural Affairs.

The current proposal is a 55 percent reduction in funds from last year and this will be a contributing factor to the demise of Arts and Cultural Organizations in the County. By adding money to offset the funds from the hotel and motel room tax, you'll provide yourself -- you'll prove yourselves to be leaders in support of Arts and Cultural Programs at the community level. Again, thank you for your past and future support of the Arts and Cultural Programs in Suffolk County and the Huntington Arts Council.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Thank you Diana. I wanted to address to you the same question that I had asked Alice earlier. What do you get in the way of State funding if anything? And how has that been impacted by the recent problems at the State level?

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

At the State level, across the board, the Arts Organizations receive funding from the New York State Council on the Arts and received a 10 percent reduction in funds. That includes, as mentioned earlier, the Huntington Arts Council administers re-granting programs for all of Suffolk County. That program is decentralization. That program again, received a 10 percent reduction in funds. In addition, for Suffolk County, we were due to receive two additional grant pools for individual and organizational stabilization grants. Those additional grant funds have been eliminated.



**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Do you have any idea as to -- if these cuts do go into effect, how that would impact on the programs that you offer, with your staffing levels?

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

Staffing levels will diminish. Programs will, hopefully, not be eliminated but definitely retracted. I know many Arts Organizations that I've talked to recently are seriously looking at their budget. I anticipate if things continue on, as they are, we'll have a reduction. Programs will become cancelled. The funding picture is not bright at all for the Arts Community. Corporations that have prior to September 11th, attacks that had made commitments to fund programs, such as exhibits that the Heckcher Museum of Art are now retracted. And so organizations are scrambling to find methods and maintain what we have and creatively look for new ways to support the programs and serve our audiences and communities.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Thank you. Any questions? Thank you very much Diana. Next speaker is Wallace Broege from the Suffolk County Historical Society.

**MR. BROEGE:**

Good morning. I'm the Director of the Suffolk County Historical Society and I'm here to speak to you about our 2002 Budget request. We're an authorized agency of Suffolk County. We were founded in 1886 and we're the oldest Historical Society in Suffolk County. We maintain a museum; a library and archives and we do Public Education Programs from our museum in Riverhead. Our purposes of the collection, the preservation interpretation of the history of the whole County.

The County Executive's recommended budget for 2002 has reduced our funding by nine thousand, four hundred and thirty dollars from the adopted level of 2001. And although that seems on the surface as a small amount of money, we're a small agency and the cut is going to hurt us at a very difficult time. Funding from other sources such as grants from the New York State Council on the Arts, money that we depend upon from our endowment and from a variety of other sources is down. So we're facing a fifty thousand-dollar deficit in 2002.

I realize that this is not the time for me to be approaching the Legislature or the County Executive and looking for a fifty thousand-dollar increase. But if we could have the nine thousand, four hundred and thirty dollars restored to our budget, it may go a long way. We have only four full time staff members and seven part time people at the Suffolk County Historical Society. I'm facing laying off two people. A full time curator, a position that we've worked very hard to re-establish. We lost that back in 1992, due to budget cuts and a part time librarian. These layoffs will hit three of our main core program areas. In the museum, it's going to mean that we're not going to be able to apply for State grants that we would run through the museum. It will mean fewer exhibits, less publicity and no doubt fewer visitors to the Historical Society. The loss of a librarian may mean that I'll have to close that library and probably the finest historical and genealogical collection and the County will be unavailable, unless unable to open it, perhaps one day a week with the help of volunteers.

The nine thousand, four hundred and thirty dollars would enable me to save both of these positions. But I may be able to save one of them and it will go a long way. So I would ask is you work through the budget process that you keep an open mind and if at all possible, restore that nine thousand, four hundred and thirty dollars to our budget. Thank you. If you have any questions about our operation in the budget, I would be happy to answer them.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

You mentioned the number of paid staff that you have. I assume that you have volunteers?

**MR. BROEGE:**

Yes, we do.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

How many volunteers do you have?

**MR. BROEGE:**

On average about twenty-five.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Because I know in this area, actually in this time of increased volunteerism, it probably is something you should be trying to encourage to get more volunteers and hopefully that would help in areas like the library.

**MR. BROEGE:**

Yes and if we're able to keep the library open, it will be, because of a volunteer. We also, we participate in two other programs to augment our staff. One is administered by the American Red Cross under court directed public service. We have two people working at the Historical Society doing work like that and we also have people from the National Council on the Aging supporting the staff too.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Thank you.

**MR. BROEGE:**

Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Fred DeFay is up next.

**MR. DEFAY:**

Good morning. My name is Fred DeFay and I'm a member of the Citizens Advisory Board that works with the Legislature for grants. Each year, the three-part structure of the County Arts Forum works as a single unit to produce, from re-grant monies, twelve months of successful programming for Suffolk County.

In 1982, the County provided two hundred and twelve thousand dollars in re-grant funds for the arts. Halfway through the year, the members of the Citizens Advisory Board met with the Program Director to examine the impact of the County's financial support on County Arts Organizations. The results of the study were astounding. From the original sum of re-grant monies, art groups could be expected to generate over twelve million dollars into Suffolk's economy. That news was good enough. But even better news was that out of a total County population at that time, of one million, three hundred thousand, more than eight hundred and forty thousand residents were served by County supported programming.

The investment of County money in the arts is clearly paying dividends throughout Suffolk. In addition, the number of Suffolk jobs provided by the Arts Industry, was one thousand, three hundred and ten. The payroll to local residents was three million, nine hundred and fifty one thousand, six hundred and sixteen dollars and funds directly expended for local purchases was three million, three hundred and seventy thousand dollars. This was 1982. In 1982, we funded sixty organizations on two hundred and twelve thousand dollars alone of Suffolk County funding. Last year, we funded one hundred and twelve organizations on two hundred and nine thousand dollars of County funding plus two hundred and sixty five thousand, nine hundred and thirty three dollars from the hotel, motel tax revenue. How can we now possibly administer to the needs of a hundred and twelve or more organizations applying for aid on only a hotel, motel tax revenue projected of two hundred and fifteen thousand dollars, one hundred ninety seven dollars?

The Suffolk County Citizens Advisory Board, together with the Legislature and the Director of Cultural Affairs, the Suffolk County Department of Economic Development have taken seriously the challenge of providing moral financial support to art groups in all categories, music, art, literature, film, theater, dance, folk art and museums.

Now entering the year 2002, twenty years later and in the darkness of our recent tragedy, the arts will serve at the inspirational source of comfort, beauty and hope. Now, lets prove that together each of the constituent parts of the County Forum will meet its commitment to the Arts with optimism, insight and a spirit of cooperation. Suffolk County can only thrive when it has its invaluable kind of support for its growth. Last year, we had one hundred and twelve. Yes, some were. Oh, I'd say about a hundred and thirty.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

The amount that they were given was not what they requested?

**MR. DEFAY:**

They varied.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Do you know what the total dollar amount was that was requested?

**MR. DEFAY:**

Probably much more than was given.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Yes. It might be helpful if you could share some of that information with Alice Amhrein, who was here earlier. Because I had asked about, you know, how much could be generated, so that might be helpful for her. Thanks for coming down.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Kathy? I'll try Kathy Wattecamps, Long Island Museum.

**MS. WATTECAMPS:**

Good morning. Kathy Wattecamps, I'm from the Long Island Museum out in Stony Brook. We're a cultural institution right in Stony Brook. We've been there since 1939. We had more than fifty-five people come; fifty five thousand people come through our doors last year. We're a grateful recipient, past support from SCOCA. They have helped us to support some of our exhibitions and some of our programs that we provide year round.

Since the World Trade disaster, World Trade Center disaster, many of our traditional sources of funding are corporate and foundation and individual supporters have diverted their funds towards disaster relief. And so we look to SCOCA to continue to provide funding for some of our exhibitions and programs. What SCOCA does, does make a difference for us. And without some of their funding, we may not be able to provide the exhibitions and programs that we have in the past. So I urge you to continue to provide the funding.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

Sally Foulke.

**MS. FOULKE:**

Good morning. I'm Sally Foulke, Interim Director of Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about our concerns for the 2002 Budget. I'm here to ask your support of the Budget Review's recommendation of an additional two hundred and forty six thousand, seven hundred and forty six dollars to our budget. This money reflects funds that were represented in last year's Omnibus and is critical to us at this time to insure the continuity of our programs and our services for 2002. Please know that we recognize the difficult times we are living in now and the strain placed on our economy. We appreciate the position that you are all in and we thank you for the support throughout this process.

I hope that you are aware of the enormous amount of research that we do and the number of people we serve in each one of your districts. By eliminating programs and reducing staff, we are taking vital services and expertise away from your constituents, who are more know in need of things than ever before. And eliminating programs and reducing staff is an unfortunate path that we have to choose, if we are not to receive additional funding. The

recommended 2002 Budget as set forth by the County Executive will significantly impact our efforts through our Family Consumer Science Programs, our 4-H Youth Development, our Agricultural Programs as well as our outreaches at the Suffolk County Farm and Education Center and our activities within our Marine Program.

In addition, the reduced County Budget puts us at risk at losing funds from the State as well as thousands of dollars that can be leveraged from our base funding. We ask that you help us to continue to do our part in supporting families and fostering programs that are vital to the economic development of this County. Please restore this critical funding and support the Legislative Budget Review's recommendation. Thank you in advance for your support.

**LEGISLATOR CARACAPPA:**

That was the last card and it pretty much sums up the portion on Parks, Cultural Affairs and Economic Development. Is there anybody else who wishes to be heard on any other matter? I saw Planning Director, Tom Isles in the audience earlier. Kim, did he plan on making a presentation? Commissioner Isles, do you plan on addressing the committee?

**MR. ISLES:**

Good morning. Well, basically I'm here if you have any questions. But I think the Planning Department accounts for a very small portion of the County Budget, less than one quarter, one percent, I believe it is. But nonetheless, the programs that we've been asked to administer by both the executive branch and legislative branch are expected to continue with the operation of the Planning Department. We have a number of major projects that we were involved in, as well as our day to day request, which for services which number in the range of three to four thousand over the course of the year -- in terms of demographic request, zoning and subdivision reviews, cartographic request that are made by the department on a daily basis.

In addition, as I mentioned, we have some larger projects that we're committed to including a major land use study of the North Shore of Suffolk County in connection with the Long Island Sound Study, where we're providing services to the Health Department. That effort began in March of this year and will be completed in April of next year.

We have another other major function of the department is that Suffolk County Planning Department is the recipient of the census information for the Nassau/Suffolk region. So with the census being completed last year, with reports coming out this year and well into next year, we're the depository for the entire by-County region. We receive numerous requests for information, as well as a requirement to do a preparation of that information analysis and interpretation of that information. That's a function here again, going into the next budget year that would be very significant.

Speaking on the side of the Real Estate Division of the Planning Department, once again, the flow of work through the Real Estate Division fluctuates with the economy and different activities conducted by the County. Two points to note on that would be number one is that the Real Estate Division will be taking on a much greater role in the handling of condemnation actions due to a decision from the State of New York to shift a lot of that to us. Where in the past, they previously did a lot of work on behalf of the County on those projects. We're now being told that we have to do those for County projects on our own. We have the capability of doing that within existing staff but it is something that will be gearing up and taking more of our time in the Real Estate Division.

In terms of acquisitions, we -- obviously, the activity of acquisitions has been extremely high. There was forty seven million dollars of acquisitions the last year, in the Year 2000. The Year 2001, the current year, we'll probably top that by a small amount. So we're spending essentially a million dollars a week in acquisitions. As far as next year with the passage at the past legislative session of the authority to do the EFC financing, if the Legislature chooses to proceed with that on specific applications that will also enable a fairly aggressive level of land acquisitions. Here again, therefore, the acquisitions unit and the staff resources in the Division of Real Estate will be necessary. Meanwhile, we do maintain a

fairly large inventory of properties through tax default. We did have a very successful real estate sales auction this past May, setting a record, in terms of the revenues, the volume of sales that we completed.

We are not conducting an auction this November, which is typically; we would two auctions a year for various reasons, not the least of which is September 11th. We will be conducting an auction in May and we'll seek to generate as much revenues as we can. That is also a function of the economy but also as a key function of the Real Estate Department, in terms of preparing and managing and consummating transactions through that auction. One aspect of that too would be the management of properties. Our current inventory is about three thousand parcels in the County's possession right now in various stages of control, meaning that many properties are still subject to redemption and are not completely free of -- to be sold at this point. The point with that then would be just be on the management of those properties and that's something the department is also involved in. That's essentially it. The Planning Department Budget is about four and a half million dollars for the year, including the Real Estate Division. And if the committee has any questions, I'll do my best to answer those questions.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

I have a question, possibly of the Chair. At one of the hearings and it might have been a general session, it was brought up that we light the LIE and while that is a New York State responsibility, we are paying for the lighting? Was that addressed in Public Works? Because I'm not on the Public Works Committee.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Nor am I. But that's something I would have to have my staff check into.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Oh good, okay. Jim, have you got an answer for us?

**MR. SPERO:**

This goes back about 20 years ago when the State agreed to put lighting on the LIE because at that time there was none. The County agreed at that time to pay the electric cost for that lighting. So they paid to install the lights and it was part of the agreement that we would maintain those lights including the electricity.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Now that's a long-term agreement that we actually signed with them?

**MR. SPERO:**

That's right.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

So we could actually change that by resolution then? Because it seems that New York State changes everything that they've agreed to fund for us and whether it's by resolution or just by executive order. So what would be the appropriate means of us changing that agreement?

**MR. SPERO:**

I don't think we could change it unilaterally. It's a contract, in the nature of a contract. So that would mean both parties would have to agree.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Have you seen a copy of the contract?

**MR. SPERO:**

I'm sure we can get one for you.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Okay and Legislator Cooper indicates that he's getting a copy of it. Good, okay. Thanks.



**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Thank you very much. I'm sorry, we may have one additional speaker. Is Ken Washington here? Ken, representing Suffolk Community Council.

**MR. WASHINGTON:**

I'm Ken Washington. I am the Project Director of the Youth Experiencing Art Project for Suffolk Community Council. I will also be speaking in front of the Education and Youth Committee this afternoon but I did want to address it in regard to Cultural Affairs. I know that this a Joint Committee. We've run a program for five years that basically, involves kids in art related projects throughout the County throughout the year. And the County Executive has seen fit for the second year in a row to zero out this line in the County Executive's Budget proposal. This zeroing out of this proposal, zeroing out of this program rather, affects two full time employees, eighteen part time employees and seven hundred children that have participated in this program over the last year. It also basically, puts us in a position where we may not be able to continue the program and move the program forward. We understand the financial difficulties of the time. We understand the difficulty with regard to the Legislature and the County Executive in the budget situation. But we would ask if you would consider restoring some of that money and if not, all of that money, because of the fact of the number of kids that it affects and the number of kids that will be left out on the streets with no basic program to participate in. I'm here to answer any questions that you might have with regard to the program and address any issues that you might want to direct.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Ken thank you very much.

**MR. WASHINGTON:**

Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Have a nice day. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

***(The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.)***